

UNITED STATES' DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:05-CV-11046 WGY

NURSE, ET AL. -
Plaintiffs

v.

ST. JOHN ST. JAMES INCORPORATED -
Defendant

PLAINTIFFS' FIRST MOTION FOR THREE-JUDGE DISTRICT COURT

The Plaintiffs received the Court's unsigned denied Order to the Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration dated August 19th, 2005 on Saturday – August 20th – 2005.

01) The Plaintiffs would like the prevalence of the head. It was not an unusual motion – it had been a common knowledge. [28 USC Section 2284]

02) Taking everything into account, someone somewhere had been playing cards with the case under the name of Judge Young. The case squarely depended on Title 42 Section 1981 and the Sections associated with the health of infants as spelt out in the Complaint. Regrettably the game of intelligence continued unabated. The Plaintiffs could see through them without any hardship central to the grace of God.

03) The case had been condemned to jurisprudence dishonesty from inception. The Complaint was filed under Title 42 and what was it, if it were not civil rights violation as it meant everything as far as law went? It defied logic that a minister of justice would take interest in obstruction of justice. That was treason! [18 USC Sections 2-4] Obviously, the interests of an insurance company exceeded the ones of the Plaintiffs hence the Court would do everything within its' discretion to condemn the Plaintiffs to touchable injury of law or deprivation of Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses. That was immoral and unlawful! Such condescension enjoyed no *judicial immunity*.

04) What had diversity of citizenship had to do when the *necessary parties* were residents of Massachusetts? The juvenile or childish manners of dealing with the

case should be re-examined! Indeed, it was not to the optimum interest of administration of justice or mankind at large. Regrettably, it was preposterous! The Court rather Judge Young if he fashioned the questionable Order had moral and legal duties to enforce the law and failure to do so had been actionable. [28 USC Sections **1346(b)** and 1361; 42 USC Sections **1985(3)** and **1986**]

CONCLUSION

Hopefully, the Court would re-examine the case with reasonable *good faith* and not abracadabra [jurisprudence methodology] The Plaintiffs could decide not to appeal the case if the Court continuously examined the case in deceitful manners. Of course, nobody had been allergic to justice. What Judge Young allegedly could not offer, the law would offer it! [28 USC Section 1361] The ball would presently be in the court of Judge Young, but it seemed that it was in another person's court. More, the Plaintiffs would like his live signature in future Orders associated with the case. Anybody could go to the computers, typed out an Order, enclosed it in an addressed envelope and mailed it.

Respectfully submitted,

JUNE NURSE AND ANOTHER,

Pro Se,

P. O. Box 1351,

Boston – MA 02117-1351.

Telephone: (617) 265 6291.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Plaintiffs did not serve the Defendant, because of the botched administration of justice processes.

JUNE NURSE AND ANOTHER,

Pro Se.